

~~SECRET~~

Journal

Office of Legislative Counsel

Monday - 20 June 1955

- - - -

25X1A


1. [] of Logistics and I met with Mr. John Nolen, Jr., Director of the staff of the National Capital Planning Commission, and Judge Parks, Counsel to the National Park Service, to discuss the problem of financing the acquisition of land for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway to the proposed site for a CIA installation at Langley. The acquisition of such land is a NCPC responsibility, but Mr. Nolen expressed concern that the possibility of CIA construction at Langley would raise real estate prices beyond the amount currently appropriated to NCPC for this purpose. He pointed out that Virginia Courts were tending to favor the owners in condemnation awards, which would also tend to raise the acquisition price. As a result, it was agreed to include in the CIA authorization request language which would permit the Agency to transfer funds to NCPC for use in the acquisition of rights of way if their own funds for this purpose were exhausted. Legislative Counsel has discussed proposed revisions of language with Mr. Hamilton of the Bureau of the Budget, and has also discussed proposed changes in language which would authorize utilization of such funds for the extension as are approved on an earlier basis than "when construction is commenced." In this way, if a firm determination to build at Langley is reached, work can commence at once to acquire the remaining rights of way for the Parkway and its own construction.

2. Mr. Perry of the Bureau of the Budget has informed Col. White that Mr. Hughes, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is leaning in favor of CIA use of prior year funds for the construction of its proposed new headquarters, and in all probability language along these lines will be included in the Military Construction Appropriations Act. If the Bureau of the Budget determines that direct appropriation is preferable, Colonel White has informed them that we would like to request the full authorization of \$59,500,000; however, Mr. Perry expressed the opinion that the Bureau of the Budget would prefer to ask for appropriations of a part of this money in the present proposed appropriation and secure the remainder after 1 January 1956. If this were to be the case, we have informed him that we would need \$2,400,000 for architecture and engineering fees,

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

\$4,000,000 for general expenditures in connection with the Parkway, \$250,000 for contingencies, and \$1,000,000 for a site, which would be a total request for \$7,000,000. It was pointed out that if we select Langley, we would need the money for A&E plus the general expenses for the Parkway, plus contingencies; but if we were to select the Winkler site we would need the funds for A&E and the site. 25X1



4. In response to the letter to the Director from Sen. Wiley regarding the proposed revision of the Internal Security Manual of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have prepared a draft reply for the DCI's signature, but have telephoned the suggested textural changes to Mr. Julius Cahn, Counsel to the Committee, and Mrs. Margolin of the Library of Congress who is editing the text.

25X1C
25X1A
25X1C
5. Former Sen. Cain of Washington called [] of ORR/Admin. to inquire about the case of [] whose job had evidently been abolished in a reduction in force. In reply to the Senator's questions, Mr. [] stated that [] was a pleasant person, likeable, and believed to be competent in his field of engineering. [] replied affirmatively in response to an inquiry as to whether [] had left as a result of a reduction in force and the Senator raised no question of security. 25X1A
25X1C

SECRET

SECRET

6. Mr. Wally Parks, of the staff of the House Committee on Government Operations, called to inquire as to the security clearance of one

25X1A

[redacted] whom the Committee is considering hiring for its new Subcommittee on Government Information. I told Mr. Parks that

25X1A

[redacted] had applied twice, but at neither time did CIA have a job for her at the grade which she desired, and that therefore no security clearance had been initiated. The new Subcommittee will deal largely with questions of release of information to the public as well as the Government's information policies, including those surrounding classified information.

3
SECRET